

BASIS FOR THE AMENDMENT

Claim 16 has been amended as supported by Examples 2.1 and 2.2.

No new matter is believed to have been added by entry of this amendment. Entry and favorable reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this amendment Claims 1-16 will now be active in this application.

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Gonzales for indicating allowing claims 10-15.

Further, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Gonzales for the helpful and courteous discussion with Applicants' Representative on September 24, 2007. During this discussion it was noted Claim 16 as currently amended was discussed. The Examiner appeared favorably convinced that US 6,429,342 fails to disclose or suggest the claimed polydispersity of 1.01-1.02.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

The present invention as set forth in Claim 16 relates to a polyetherol obtained by a process as claimed in claim 10, **having a polydispersity of 1.01-1.02**.

The rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Clement et al. (US 6,429,342) is respectfully traversed.

Clement et al. fails to disclose or suggest polyetherols having a **polydispersity of 1.01-1.02**. The polyetherols are different because a different catalyst is used to make them.

Clement et al. disclose a process for polymerization of ethylene oxide using metal cyanide catalysts, see abstract. These metal cyanide catalysts correspond to the general formula in column 6, line 3 of Clement et al. In addition, Clement et al. disclose polyetherols, which are obtained by a process of the addition of ethylene oxide to suitable starter compounds. The polyetherols, which are obtained by the process according to

Clement et al., show polydispersities of, for example, 1.06 (Example 1.B), 2.03 (Example 6), 1.37 (Example 7), and 1.1 (Example 8) etc.

In contrast, the claimed polyetherols of the present application are obtained by the process according to Claim 10 using a different catalyst and are as a result different from the polyetherols according to Clement et al.

The process for preparation of polyetherols according to Claim 10 using a specific catalyst makes it possible to obtain novel polyetherols which have very low polydispersity values of 1.01 - 1.02. These very low values of polydispersity are based on the specific process for the preparation of these polyetherols, using the novel catalyst being a multimetal oxide compound of formula (I) according to claim 10 of the present application.

Therefore, the polyetherols as claimed in Claim 16 of the present application are different from the polyetherols of Clement et al and are not anticipated by Clement et al.

Examples 2.1 and 2.2 on pages 12 to 17 show that polyetherols which are obtained by the process according to Claim 10 of the present application have advantageous characteristics compared to polyetherols obtained by other processes. For example, on page 15, lines 9-12, it is mentioned that the product obtained has a polydispersity of 1.01, a molecular weight of $M_w = 151.7$ g/mol, an iodine number of $IN(K) < 1$ g of iodine/100 g and a residual metal content of 12 ppm of antimony and 1 ppm of zinc. According to the last paragraph on page 15, a second polyetherol, which is prepared by the process according to the present invention, shows similar values of the mentioned characteristics.

In contrast to these examples according to the invention, on page 16, Example 2.3 is mentioned, wherein a different catalyst is used in a process for preparation of polyetherols. The product obtained has a polydispersity of only 1.75, the molecular weight is higher and also the metal contents of antimony and zinc are increased, compared to the examples according to the present invention.

The polyetherols which are disclosed in Clement et al., show high dispersities of up to **2.03** (Example 6), or **1.66** (Example 9.B) and this reference fails to disclose or suggest polyetherols having a **polydispersity of 1.01-1.02**.

Therefore, the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Clement et al. (US 6,429,342) is believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

This application presents allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is kindly requested to pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the claims or otherwise wish to discuss this case, he is kindly invited to contact Applicants' below-signed representative, who would be happy to provide any assistance deemed necessary in speeding this application to allowance.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
NFO:KAG:
(OSMMN 08/07)


Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 47,297